

The Primitive Republican

F. G. BALDWIN,

OLD SERIES, VOL. X NO. 38.

COLUMBUS, MISSISSIPPI, THURSDAY, AUGUST 26, 1852.

NEW SERIES, VOL. 3 NO. 21

THE REPUBLICAN.

Is published every Thursday Morning.

OFFICE on the South East corner of Main and St. John Streets, immediately above the Grocery Store of JACOB ISAACS.

TERMS: Three Dollars a year in advance. Single Copies, 10 Cents. Subscribers, who will be charged \$1.50 when payment is delayed six months, and \$4.00 if not paid until the end of the year.

RATES OF ADVERTISING: One Dollar a square for first insertion; and 50 Cents a square for each continuation. Ten lines or less constitute a square.

PROFESSIONAL CARDS a year \$10.00. For less time \$1.25 per month. Professional Cards published & paper furnished at one year at \$12.00.

ORDINARY NOTICES exceeding 15 lines charged at the discretion of the Publisher.

Advertisements for the year contracted for at a liberal discount.

All communications addressed to the Editor must be paid, in order to insure attention.

JOB PRINTING: Of all kinds NEATLY and PROMPTLY executed.

BLANKS: For Sheriffs, Magistrates, Constables, Clerks &c. furnished at shortest notice, from \$1.25 to \$1.50 a square according to quality.

SOCIETIES IN LOWNESS COUNTY.

MASONIC.

COLUMBUS LODGE, No. 5.

S. S. Franklin, W. M. | N. E. Goodwin, Sec'y.

Meets at Columbus, on the 1st Friday of each month.

LOWNESS LODGE, No. 114.

A. W. Linscomb, W. M. | O. T. Keeler, Sec'y.

Meets at Columbus, on the 3rd Friday of each month.

DANLEY LINSOMB LODGE, No. 144.

Scott Thompson, W. M. | Richardson, Sec'y.

Meets at Columbus, on the 3rd Friday of each month.

COLUMBUS R. A. CHAPTER, No. 4.

C. H. Allen, H. P. | N. E. Goodwin, Sec'y.

Meets at Columbus, on the 1st Monday after 1st Friday of each month.

I. O. O. F.

COLUMBUS LODGE, No. 20.

H. L. Bailey, N. G. | T. H. Williams, Secretary.

Meets at Columbus, every Saturday night.

McKENZIE LODGE, No. 32.

Dank Williams, N. G. | N. E. Davis, Secretary.

Meets at Columbus, every Monday night.

FAVORITE LODGE, No. 38.

M. R. Groom, N. G. | W. Downing, Sec'y.

Meets at Boston, every Friday night.

THURSDAY ENCAMPMENT, No. 6.

H. L. Bailey, C. P. | H. Hale, Secretary.

Meets at Columbus, on the 1st and 3rd Tuesdays in each month.

S. O. F.

COLUMBUS DIVISION No. 9, Sons of Temperance.

The stated meetings of this Division are held at Temperance Hall at Columbus, every Tuesday evening at 7 o'clock.

DR. J. BROWN RIGG.

Has removed to the well known office formerly occupied by Dr. Leane, opposite Pope's Hotel where he may be found ready to attend promptly to professional calls in Columbus, and to the surrounding country.

Columbus, Miss. Jan. 31, 1852. 44-17.

HENRY STODDARD & CO.

WHOLESALE & RETAIL DEALERS IN

DRUGS AND SHOES.

Corner Court and Water Streets, MOBILE, ALA.

JO. H. STODDARD, JAMES TAIT.

We would respectfully call the attention of the public to the fact that we have on hand a large stock of the above articles, which we have selected with the greatest care, and at the lowest prices, and we are prepared to sell at a discount.

We are at all times prepared to furnish to the Trade, every style of Goods in our line, at satisfactory prices, and would respectfully solicit orders.

Oct. 3rd, 1850. 24-6m.

HENRY & CO.

Importers and Dealers in Foreign and Domestic Dry Goods.

Corner Court and Water Streets, MOBILE, ALA.

Are constantly receiving by Foreign Arrival, and from the best manufacturers in the country New and Seasonable GOODS adapted to the Southern trade, to which they invite the attention of Wholesale and Retail Purchasers.

PLANTATION GOODS.

In great variety: Blankets, Kersyes, Linseys, Ombre, Brown Shirtings, Sheetings, Bleached, Striped Domestic, Deans, Cottons, Twines, Kentucky Jeans, Sattins, Bed Tickings, Checks, &c.

ONE PRICE ONLY.

Oct. 3. 1850. 24-6m.

CARVER & RYLAND.

LATE T. J. CARVER & CO.

MOBILE, ALA.

Booksellers Publishers, Stationers and Blank Book Manufacturers.

Keep constantly on hand a large supply of Law, Theological, Medical, Miscellaneous and School Books.

Also a complete supply of

Finery and Staple Stationery.

Embracing in part, Cap, Letter, Record and Note Paper, Envelopes, Drawing Paper, Bristol Boards &c. &c.

Account Books, of every description and of any required pattern, made at short notice. They are also agents for the

TUSCALOOSA PAPER MILL,

and can supply Newspaper Publishers with Printing Paper, of all sizes, and of the best quality; also, Book and Printers' Ink, &c. &c.

Our friends and the public of Columbus and Abbeville, Miss., and the surrounding country, are respectfully invited to give us a call.

T. J. CARVER, A. H. RYLAND.

Mobile, 1852. 46.

W. A. SMITH, (Successor to Dalbey & Smith)

Printer, of all sizes, and of the best quality. Jan. 1850-19-17.

J. O. BANKS, TUSCALOOSA.

ALLEN & BANKS, COMMISSION MERCHANTS, MOBILE, ALA.

MARCY'S REPLY TO SCOTT.

WAR DEPARTMENT,

Washington, April 21, 1848.

Sir: It would not be respectful to you to pass unnoticed your extraordinary letter of the 24th of February, nor just to myself to permit it to remain unanswered on the files of this department.

To attempt to dispel the delusions which you seem to have long pertinaciously cherished, and to correct the errors into which you have fallen, devolves upon me a duty which I must not decline; but, in performing it, I mean to be as cautious as you profess to have been to abstain from any "wanton discourses," and I hope to be as successful. Your prudent respect for the "4th article of war" has induced you to hold me ostensibly responsible for many things which you are aware are not fairly chargeable to me. The device you have adopted to assail the President, by aiming your blows at the Secretary of War, does more credit to your ingenuity as an accuser, than to your character as a soldier. A premeditated contrivance to avoid responsibility, does not indicate an intention not to do wrong.

The general aspect of your letter discloses an evident design to create a belief that you were drawn forth from your quiet position, in a bureau of this department, and assigned to the command of our armies in Mexico, for the purpose of being sacrificed; and that, to accomplish this end, "neglects, disappointments, injuries, and rebukes" "were inflicted on you, and the necessary means of prosecuting the war with success withheld;" or, in other words, the government, after preferring you to any other of the gallant generals within the range of its choice, had labored to frustrate its own plans, to bring defeat upon its own armies, and involve itself in ruin and disgrace, for an object so unimpressive in its leading upon public affairs. A charge so entirely preposterous, so utterly repugnant to all the probabilities of human conduct, calls for no refutation.

For other purposes than to combat this fondly cherished chimera, it is proper that I should notice some of your specific allegations.

It is true that, after you were designated for the chief command of our armies, the President was desirous that your departure should not be unnecessarily delayed; but you were not restricted, as you allege, to "only four days" to make the necessary preparations for your departure. This solicited indulgence, which you have reported that these preparations were so far completed that your presence here was no longer required. Then instead of going directly to Mexico, you were permitted, at your own request, to take a circuitous route through New York, and there to remain a few days. You stated at New York nearly an entire week; and not until the 19th of December (twenty-six days after leaving Washington) did you reach New Orleans, where you would have arrived in seven days if you had been required to take the direct route. This solicited indulgence, by which your arrival at New Orleans was delayed nearly three weeks, is incompatible with your allegation that you were allowed "only four days" at Washington, where twenty might have been most advantageously employed. This complaint has relation to facts within your own knowledge; error, therefore, is hardly reconcilable with any solicitude to be accurate. As this is your opening charge against the War Department, and may be regarded as indicative of those which follow, I shall make the refutation of it still more complete, for the purpose of showing with what recklessness you have performed the functions of an accuser, and how little reliance, in the present state of your feelings, can be placed on your memory. You are the witness by whom your allegation is to be disproved. On the day of your departure from Washington, you left with me a paper, in your own handwriting, dated November 23, 1846, with the following heading:

"Notes suggesting topics to be embraced in the Secretary's instructions to General S., drawn up (in haste) at the request of the former."

From that paper I extract the following paragraph: "The Secretary of War has pleased to learn from [Gen. Scott] that you have in a very few days already, through the general staff of the army here, laid a sufficient basis for the purposes with which you are charged, and that you now think it best to proceed at once to the southwest, in order to organize the largest number of troops that can be obtained in time for that most important expedition"—[the expedition against Vera Cruz].

Here is your own most explicit admission that you represented to the Secretary of War, before leaving Washington, that arrangements were so far completed that you thought it best to proceed at once to the army in Mexico; and yet you make it your opening charge against the department, that you were forced away to Mexico before you had time for necessary preparations.

I present the next charge in your own language: "I handed to you a written request that one of three of our accomplished captains, therein named, might be appointed assistant adjutant general, with the rank of major, for duty with me in the field, and there was a vacancy at the time for one. My request has never been attended to, and thus I have had no officer of the Adjutant General's Department with me in the campaign. Can another instance be cited of denying to a large army, or even a small one, the selection of his chief of the staff—that is, the chief of the department of orders and correspondence?"

Were the case precisely as you have stated it to be, you have given too much prominence, as a matter of complaint, to the President's refusal to be controlled, in the exercise of the appointing power, by your wishes. Had there been a vacancy such as you mention for "one of the accomplished captains" you named, no one knows better than you do that your request could not have been attended to without departing from the uniform rule of selection for staff appointments without violating the right of several officers to regular promotion, and offering an indignity to all those who held the position of assistant general, with rank of captain. The rule of regular promotion in the staff is as inflexible, and has been as uniformly observed, as that in the

line. It must appear surprising that you, who were so deeply "shocked and distressed" at the suggestion of appointing, by authority of Congress, a "citizen lieutenant general," or vesting the President with power to devolve the command of the army on a major general without regard to priority in the date of his commission, should, in your request, after being assigned to command, ask the President to disregard the rights of at least four officers as meritorious as "the three accomplished captains" named by you. The President's views on this subject undoubtedly differ from yours. His regard for the rights of officers is not graduated by their rank. Those of captains and major generals have equal value in his estimation, and an equal claim to his respect and protection. I cannot admit that it is a just ground of censure and rebuke against the "head of the War Department" that the President did not see fit, in order to gratify your feelings of favoritism, to disregard the claims and violate the rights of all the assistant adjutants general of the rank of captain then in commission.

But, so far as it is made a ground of complaint and reproach, this is not the worst aspect of the case. You are entirely mistaken in the assertion that there was then a vacancy in the Adjutant General's staff, with the rank of major, to which either of the captains recommended by you could have been properly appointed. There was no such vacancy. To show the correctness of this statement, and to demonstrate your error, I appeal to the Army Register and the records of the Adjutant General's office. Your mistake as to an obvious fact lying within the range of matters with which you are presumed to be familiar, has excited less surprise than the declaration that, by the non-compliance of your request, you "have had no officer of the Adjutant General's department with me [you] in the campaign."

Every officer of that department—at least eight—was, as you well know, subject to your command. When you arrived in Mexico, there were with the army at least five assistant adjutants general, all at your service. That you chose to employ none of them at your headquarters, and detached from other appropriate duties an officer to act as an assistant adjutant general, may well be regarded as a slight to the whole of that staff then with you in Mexico, and a cause of complaint, but certainly not a complaint to emanate from you against the War Department.

Willing as I am to presume, though unable to conceive, that circumstances justified you in passing over all the assistant adjutants general then with the army, and in selecting an officer of the line to perform the duties of adjutant, though there was no vacancy in the adjutant general's staff of the grade of major, for which only you recommended the "accomplished captains," and to which only they were properly eligible, there was a vacancy in it of the rank of captain. For this position you recommended an officer in General Wool's staff, then on the Chihuahua expedition. This officer was subsequently appointed assistant adjutant general, with the rank of captain, as you desired, and has ever since been at the headquarters of the army. Thus it will be perceived that your request, so far as it was proper and reasonable, was actually complied with.

The next specification in the catalogue of charges preferred against me, is that a court-martial was not instituted by the President for the trial of General Marshall and Capt. Montgomery on your charges against them. The offences imputed to them were certainly not of an aggravated character. The one, as was alleged, had been incautious in relation to the discovery of a mine, and the other, in admitting of its coming to the knowledge of the enemy, and the other had not carried a despatch with as much expedition as you thought he might have done. As one was a general officer, a court to try him must have been composed of officers of high rank. Before the order for assembling it could have reached Mexico, it was foreseen that your command would be at Vera Cruz, and probably engaged in active service of that city. Officers could not, therefore, have been then sent from your column to Monterey or the Rio Grande, (where the court must have been held,) without great detriment to the public service. Had you been deprived of several officers of high rank at that critical period by the order of the President, it would have afforded a better proof of complaint than any one in your extended catalogue. Had the court been composed of officers from General Taylor's command, it would have still further weakened his condition, already weak in consequence of the very large force you had withdrawn from him. Subsequent events have proved that it was most fortunate the President did not comply with your request, for, had he done so, some of the officers highest in rank, and most conspicuous at Buena Vista, might, at that critical juncture, have been separated from their commands, and engaged on a court at a distance from the glorious scene of action. It is not fanciful to suppose that their absence might have changed the future of that eventful day; and that, instead of rejoicing, as we now do, in a triumphant victory—among the most brilliant in the whole course of the war—we might have had to lament a most disastrous defeat, and the almost total loss of the whole force you had left to sustain that frontier. No man has more reason than yourself to rejoice that no order emanated from Washington, though requested by you, which would have further impaired the efficiency of Gen. Taylor's command in the crisis that then awaited him.

My letter of the 22d of February, conveying the President's views in regard to your order depriving Col. Harney of his appropriate command, is severely arraigned by you as offensive, both in manner and matter.

The facts in relation to this case of alleged grievance are now before the public, and a brief allusion to them will place the transaction in its true light. Under your orders Col. Harney had brought seven companies of his regiment—the 2nd dragoons—from Monterey to the Brazos, to be under your immediate command; and two others—being all of the regiment in Mexico—were expected to follow within a few days. In the midst of his high hopes and ardent desire for active service, you took from him the command of his own regiment, devolved it on one of his junior officers, and ordered him back to Gen. Taylor's line to look for what was not inappropriately denominated "an imaginary command." Outraged in his feelings and injured in his rights, he respectfully remonstrated; his appeal to your sense of justice was availing. Neither to this gallant officer nor to the President did you assign any sufficient or even plausible reason for this extraordinary proceeding. The whole army, I believe, and the whole country, when the transaction became known, entertained but one opinion on the subject—and that was, that you had inflicted an injury and an outrage upon a brave and meritorious officer. Such an act—almost the first on your assuming command—boded disastrous consequences to the public service, and developed upon the President the duty of interposing to protect the injured officer. This interposition you have made a grave matter of accusation against the head of the War Department, and have characterized it as a censure and a rebuke. It may imply both, and still be merited, may leave you without a pretence for complaint. The President, after alluding to his duty to sustain the rights of the officers under your command, as well as your own rights, informed you that he did not discover in the case, as you had presented it, sufficient cause for such an order; that, in his opinion, Col. Harney had a just cause to complain; and that he hoped the matter had been reconsidered by you, and the Colonel restored to his appropriate command. Your own subsequent course in this case demonstrates the unreasonableness of your complaint, and vindicates the correctness of the President's proceedings. You had really rebuked and censured your own conduct; for even before you had received the President's views, you had, as he hoped you would, reconsidered the matter, become convinced of your error, reversed your own order, and restored Col. Harney to his command; thus giving the strongest evidence in favor of the propriety and correctness of all the President had done in the case. I give you too much credit for steadiness of purpose, to suppose that you retraced your steps from mere caprice, or for any other cause than a conviction that you had fallen into error. After the matter had thus terminated, it appears unaccountable to me that you, who above all others should wish it to pass into oblivion, have again called attention to it by making it an item in your arraignment of the War Department.

You struggle in vain to vindicate your course in this case, by referring to your own acts in the campaign of 1847. You then sent away, as you allege, against your wishes, "three senior field officers of as many regiments who were inferior, uneducated, and inefficient, in favor of three juniors, and with the subsequent approbation of Major General Brown and the head of the War Department." This precedent does not, in your judgment, change the aspect of the present case. Col. Harney was not "inferior, uneducated, and inefficient;" you did not assign, and, in deference to the known opinion of the army and country, you did not venture to assign that reason for deposing him. I do not understand the force of your logical deduction, that because you, on a former occasion, had deprived officers under your command for good and sufficient reasons, with subsequent approval, you may now, and at any time, do the same thing without any reason whatever; and if the President interposes to correct the procedure, you have a just cause to complain of an indignity and a right to arraign the War Department.

As your animadversion upon the tone of my letter is probably not a blow aimed at a much more conspicuous object, to be reached through me, I ought, perhaps, to pass it without notice. On revision of that letter, I cannot perceive that it is not entirely respectful in manner and language. The views of the subject are there set forth in a moderate, because they were confidently entertained. It seemed to be admitted by you that, "if dictated to the greatest General of the recent appointments," the letter would not have been exceptional. I was not aware that it was my duty to modify and graduate my style so as to meet, according to your fastidious views, the various degrees of greenness and ripeness of the Generals to whom I am required to convey the orders of the President; and for any such defect in my official communications I have no apologies to offer.

In the same letter wherein you complain of being censured for the course in relation to the prisoners taken at Cerro Gordo, you speak of the "unavoidable" necessity, in view of the prisoners taken at Cerro Gordo, even before one word of commendation from the government had reached this army, on account of his gallant conduct in the capture of those prisoners. Accident alone—not any oversight or neglect on my part—has given you the apparent advantage of the aggravation which you have so artfully thrown into this charge; my letter commending yourself and the gallant army under your command for the glorious victory at Cerro Gordo, was written and sent to you on 19th of May—eleven days before that which you are pleased to consider as containing a rebuke.

But I meet the main charge with a positive denial. You never were rebuked for discharging the prisoners taken at Cerro Gordo. This issue can be tried by the record. All that was ever said on the subject is contained in the following extract from my letter of the 13th of May:

"Your course hitherto in relation to prisoners of war, both men and officers, in discharging them on parole, has been liberal and kind; but whether it ought to be still longer continued, or in some respects changed, has been under the consideration of the President, and he has directed you to communicate to his views on the subject. He is not unaware of the great embarrassment their detention, or the sending of them to the United States, would occasion; but, so far as relates to the officers, he thinks they should be detained until duly exchanged. In that case, it will probably be found expedient to send them, or most of them, to the United States. You will not, therefore, except for special reasons in particular cases, discharge the officers who may be taken prisoners, but detain them with you, or send them to the United States, as you shall deem most expedient."

I understand the force of terms, there is nothing in this language which, by fair interpretation, can be made to express or imply a rebuke. I cannot conceive that a man, otherwise than one of a diseased sensibility, over-anxious to discover causes for complaint and accusation, could imagine that anything like a rebuke was contained in this extract; yet on this unsubstantial basis alone you have erected the charge, over and over again repeated, that you were rebuked by the War Department for discharging the prisoners captured at Cerro Gordo. If, in case where it was so easy to be right, and so difficult to get wrong, you could fall into such an obvious mistake, what may not be expected from you in other matters where your perverted feelings have a freer and a wider range.

Before considering your complaints for not having been supplied with sufficient means of transportation for the expedition against Vera Cruz, I will notice your "four memorials" to the War Department, in which you demonstrated, as you state, that "Vera Cruz was the true basis of operations, and that the enemy's capital could not probably be reached from the Rio Grande."

I cannot discover the pertinency of allusion to these four memorials, except it be to put forth a claim to the merit of originating the expedition against Vera Cruz, and of being the first to discover that the most practicable route to the city of Mexico was from that point on the Gulf; but your known abhorrence for a "prurience of fame not earned" ought to shield you from the suspicion of such an infirmity.

I am sure you are not ignorant of the fact—but if you are, it is nevertheless true—that the expedition against Vera Cruz had been for some time under consideration; that great pains had been taken to get information as to the defenses of that city, the strength of the castle, and the difficulties which would attend the debarkation of troops; that maps had been procured and carefully examined; that persons who had resided there, and officers of the army and navy, had been consulted on the subject, and the enterprise actually resolved on before the date of your first memoir, and before you were thought of to conduct it.

As early as the 9th of July, 1846, within two months after the declaration of war, and before the main body of troops raised for its prosecution had reached the scene of operations, considerable attention had been given to that subject. On that day, a letter from this department to Gen. Taylor thus alluded to a movement from Vera Cruz into the interior of the enemy's country:

"If, from all the information which you may communicate to the department, as well as that derived from other sources, it should appear that the difficulties and obstacles to the conducting of a campaign from the Rio Grande, the present base of your operations, for any considerable distance into the interior of Mexico, will be very great, the department will consider whether the main invasion should not ultimately take place from some point on the coast—say Tampico, or some other point in the vicinity of Vera Cruz. This suggestion is made with a view to call your attention to it, and to obtain from you such information as you may be able to impart. Should it be determined that the main army should invade Mexico at some other point than the Rio Grande—say the vicinity of Vera Cruz—a large and sufficient number of transport vessels could be placed at the mouth of the Rio Grande by the time the healthy season sets in—say early in November. The main army, with all its munitions, could be transported, leaving a sufficient force behind to hold and occupy the Rio Grande, and all the towns and provinces which you may have conquered before that time. In the event of such being the plan of operations, your opinion is desired what increased force, if any, will be required to carry it out with success. We learn that the army could be disembarked a few miles distant from Vera Cruz, and readily enter the town in its rear, without coming within the range of the guns of the fortress of San Juan d'Ulloa. The town could be readily taken by land, while the fortress, being invested by land and sea, and all communication cut off, must soon fall. From Vera Cruz to the city of Mexico there is a fine road, upon which the diligences or stage coaches run daily. The distance from Vera Cruz to the city of Mexico is not more than one-third of that from the Rio Grande to the city of Mexico."

The subject was again brought into view on the 13th of October, in the 22d of October, in letters addressed to General Taylor. At the last date, the plan had been so far matured that several officers of the staff and line were indicated for that service. This was nearly a month before it was determined to employ you with the army in any part of Mexico.

It was never contemplated here to strike at the city of Mexico from the line occupied by General Taylor, or through any other except that from Vera Cruz. If the war was to be pushed to that extent, it required no demonstration—no professed military talents—nothing more than common sagacity and very slight reflection on the subject, to see the propriety and necessity of making the Atlantic cities the base of military operations. An allied detachment of transports to transport the troops in the expedition to Vera Cruz seems to be most prominently presented, and most confidently relied on to sustain your charge against the War Department for neglecting this branch of its duties.

I issued, it seems to be admitted, the proper order, so far as the means of transportation were to be drawn from the North; but the allegation is that it was issued too late, and was never executed. It was issued at least four days before you arrived at New Orleans, on your way to the army. If promptly executed, it was a reasonable calculation that the "ten vessels" alluded to in your letter, would have arrived in season to receive the troops, as soon as you could collect them from their remote and scattered positions in the interior of Mexico, bring them to the sea coast, and prepare for their embarkation. Whether an order for ships to be sent out in ballast, issued the 15th of December, was or was not in season for the service they were designed for, depends upon the time when the expedition could be got ready to sail. To determine this, a regard must be paid for what you required to be done preparatory to the expedition, rather than to what you may have said on the subject.

A reference to two or three of your requisitions will show that no rational hope could be entertained that the expedition would set forth before the middle of the last February. You required as one item of the outfit, one hundred and forty mule boats—all to be constructed after you left Washington. Though the department urged a less number you insisted on all. You estimated the expense of

each at \$200; and thought, by putting the principal ship-yards on the Atlantic coast in requisition they might be constructed by the first of January. To show what reliance was to be placed on your calculation, I refer to the fact that, though due regard to economy was had in procuring these boats, each cost an average of \$950, nearly fivefold your estimate. Conceding that you erred much less as to the time within which they could be constructed—may more, admitting they could have been ready by the 1st of January—and sooner you did not expect they could be made—by no reasonable calculation could they have reached the coast of Mexico before the first of February.

The expedition could not go forth without them. In your letter to me dated the 28th of February, off Lobos, you state that but a small part of the transports engaged at New Orleans, under your orders of the 28th December, &c., had arrived, and "not one of the ten ordered by your (my) memorandum of the 15th of that month, and the whole were due at the Brazos on the 15th of January." Having thus shown, by your own opinion, that under my order "the ten vessels" ought to have been at the Brazos at least fifteen days before the expedition could have been ready to sail, I have vindicated myself from your charge of having neglected my duty by not issuing that order at an earlier date. If issued earlier, it would have involved a largely increased expenditure for demurrage, and resulted in no public benefit.

But the graver part of this charge is that none of these "ten vessels" ever arrived. "Relying (you say in the letter now under consideration) upon them (ten vessels) confidently, the embarkation was delayed in whole or in part at the Brazos and Tampico, from the 15th of January to the 9th of March, leaving, it was feared, not half the time needed for the reduction of Vera Cruz and its castle before the return of the 'yellow fever.'" To whomsoever the calculations concerning the non-arrival of these "ten vessels," and your "great disappointment" in relation to them, are imputable, he has certainly involved himself in a serious responsibility. I hope to remove the whole of it from the "head of the War Department," and to entertain some apprehensions that it will fall in part upon the commanding General of the expedition.

The execution of the whole of the most difficult branch of the duties appertaining to a military expedition—providing for transportation—is, by the distribution of the business in the War Department, all to be done by the Quartermaster General. As an expedition against Vera Cruz had been resolved on some time before you were assigned to take command of it, General Jessup had gone to New Orleans to be in the best position to make the necessary preparations for such an enterprise. From his great knowledge and long experience in military affairs, not only in his appropriate department, but as a commander in the field, the government thought it fortunate that you could have the advice and assistance of so able a counselor.

Your suggestion that it might be necessary to send ships in ballast from the North for transports was not neglected or unheeded by me. Whether it would be necessary or not, depended, according to your statement to me, upon the means of transportation which could be procured at New Orleans, &c. My first step was to write to the Quartermaster General, then at that place, for information on that subject. In my letter to him of the 11th of December, I said:

"It is expected that most of the vessels in the service of the Quartermaster's Department can be used as transports for the expedition. It will be necessary that the department here should know what portion of the transportation can be furnished by the ordinary means which the Quartermaster's Department has now under its control for the purposes of its expedition. I have to request that information on this point should be furnished without delay."

"Another point on which the department desires information is, what amount of means of transportation for such an expedition can be furnished at New Orleans, Mobile, and in that quarter."

"The expense of procuring transports from the Atlantic cities will be exorbitant. Freight is very high, and most of the good vessels are engaged for the ordinary purposes of commerce."

It is important to bear in mind that you saw this letter on your first arrival at New Orleans. In writing to me from that place, December 21, you observe: "I have seen your letter (in the hands of Lieutenant Hunt) to the Quartermaster General, dated the 11th." You could not mistake its object, because it was clearly expressed. I asked distinctly what means of transportation for the expedition can be furnished at New Orleans, &c., and referred to the expense and difficulty of procuring transports from the Atlantic cities. You could not, therefore, but know that my course as to sending ships in ballast from the North would be regulated by the Quartermaster's reply.

While waiting for this information, and in order to prevent delay, and to be sure not to deserve the imputation you now cast upon me, I issued the order of the 15th of December, to which you refer, knowing that it could be modified and conformed to the exigencies of the service, according to the answer I should receive from General Jessup. His reply is dated the 27th of December, and in it he says:

"Transportation can be provided here for all the troops that may be drawn from the army under the command of General Taylor, and for all the ordnance, ordnance stores, and other supplies, which may be drawn either from this depot (the Brazos) or from New Orleans. The public transports—I mean those owned by the United States—which can be spared for the contemplated operations, is estimated, will carry three thousand men, with all their supplies. Vessels can be chartered on favorable terms, for any additional transportation that may be required." This letter was submitted to and read by you, as appears from your endorsement thereon.

After referring to some other matters in the letter, you conclude your endorsement as follows: "I recommend that General Taylor's suggestion be adopted." This fact shows that the letter received your particular attention. When this letter (which you knew was forwarded to the department) was here received—showing that your apprehended difficulty in obtaining sufficient transportation at the South ended

was unfounded, and that it could be provided in that quarter in great abundance, on favorable terms—my order of the 15th of December, so far, and only so far as it related to sending out vessels in ballast, was countermanded. It is strange indeed, that, after you were made acquainted with the object of my enquiries and General Jessup's letter in reply to them, you should have looked for transport vessels in ballast from the Atlantic cities, and still more strange